

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. 10/622,916 07/17/2003 Giorgio Vergani 59183-8027.US06 2748 22918 04/15/2005 **EXAMINER** PERKINS COIE LLP LANGEL, WAYNE A P.O. BOX 2168 MENLO PARK, CA 94026 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1754

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summer	10/622,916	VERGANI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Wayne Langel	1754
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 69-89</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>69-89</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) 87 is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to See 37 CER 1 121(d)		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage		
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sun	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Info 6) Other:	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/622,916

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 69-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no "description support" in the original specification for all the limitations recited in claims 69-89. For example, in ncliam 69 there is no support for producing the oxides of iron and manganese by thermally reducing hydroxides of iropn and manganese. In claim 70, there is no support for pretreating by adding zeolites. In claims 71, 72, 76, 77 and 81, there is no support for the temperature limitations recited therein. In claims 73, 78 and 83, there is no support for pretreating salts of iron and manganese to produce hydroxides of iron and manganese. In claim 82, there is no support for providing zeolites in contact with the getter material. In claim 79, there is no support for gettering "at least" oxygen contaminants from the stream of ammonia. In claims 84-86, there is no support for reducing the levels of oxygen to the recited values. In claim 89, there is no support for flowing the stream of gaseous ammonia over a dryer material.

Claims 69-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 69, line 4, there is no antecedent basis for "said oxides". In claim 79, line 4, there is no antecedent basis for "oxygen contaminants". In claim 70, it is indefinite as to what is being treated in the "pretreatment step". In claims 73 and 83, it is indefinite as to whether the "hydroxides of iron and

manganese" would necessarily be the "hydroxides of iron and manganese" as recited in claims 69 and 79, respectively.

Page 3

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 69-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kobayashi et al (of record). Kobayashi et al disclose a method which includes the step of passing ammonia over a catalyst which may comprise Fe and Mn. (See the Abstract and col. 9, lines 47-56.) Oxygen contaminants would inherently be removed from the ammonia in the process of Kobayashi et al. Regarding claim 69, Kobayashi et al disclose a reaction temperature of 10 C to 0 C at col. 10, lines 34-37.

Claim 87 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (b) in failing to differ substantially from claim 79, in that the stream would inherently be contacted with the geter material in the process recited in claim 79.

Claim 1 is allowed

Application/Control Number: 10/622,916

Art Unit: 1754

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Wayne Langel

at telephone number 571-272-1353.

Wayne Langel Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1754